

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556

Department of History
239-7266

21 February 1989

Mr. Harold Weisberg,
7627 Old Receiver Road,
FREDRICK, Maryland 21701,
U.S.A.

Dear Mr. Weisberg:

It appears to be difficult for you to be civil where you disagree with someone. The letters you have written to Walton Collins and to me about my essay on President Kennedy's assassination are not civil by any standard or in any language. When people, especially educated people, disagree they ought to be civil with one another, but civility seems to have deserted you.

Whatever your first sentence in your last letter [you have dated it 1/14/88, but probably mean 1/14/89] has to do with Kennedy's assassination or my essay on this event is unclear to me and beyond my comprehension. I am visiting at the University of Victoria this term and for you to see something sinister in my response on Notre Dame stationery sent in a University of Victoria envelope is a serious reflection on you.

However, all I want to do is to stick to the matter that seems to exercise you the most--the publication date of your book, Whitewash. Thank you for sending the Copyright page of 1965 for your book. But you forgot to send the other publication dates of Whitewash, Vols. I-IV (Hyattstown, Maryland: Self Published, 1965, 1966, 1967, 1974) and Vols. I and II (N.Y.: Dell, 1966-1967). I wonder why you included only the 1965 date in what you sent me and left out the other dates of publication, including 1966--the date of publication I used. How could you have forgotten the other dates of publication of your own book?

In your recent letter you wrote about me, "You insist it [Whitewash] was not published until 1965." This is neither correct nor true, and I am puzzled how such an inaccurate and untrue statement could come from someone as self-righteous as you are about accuracy and truth.

I merely listed a 1966 publication date of your book in my essay and never indicated or said anywhere that your book was not published until 1966. That is just a figment of your imagination. Since four publication dates--1965, 1966, 1967, 1974--are listed for your book, why are you so exercised about my using 1966 instead of 1965 or 1967, or 1974 for that matter? Why do you accuse me of a factual error in using the 1966 date when you ought to know there is a 1966 date to be used?

Again, as I said in my 9 January 1989 letter, the date of publication for your book Whitewash in the Notre Dame Library is 1966, and 1966 is the date I used.

Mr. Harold Weisberg

- 2 -

21 February 1989

I also want to point out to you that other writers list 1966 as the date of publication for your Whitewash. In a random look at some of the books on the Kennedy assassination in the University of Victoria library, the following list 1966 as the date of publication of Whitewash: Henry Hurt, Reasonable Doubt, An Investigation into the Assassination of John F. Kennedy (1985), Bibliography, p. 531; Anthony Summers, Conspiracy (1980), Bibliography, p. 616; and G. Robert Blakey and Richard N. Billings, The Plot to Kill the President (1981), Bibliography, p. 406. Even David R. Wrone, whom you described in your 11/6/88 letter to Collins as "co-author of the recognized scholarly bibliography of JFK assassination literature," has listed 1966 as the publication date of Whitewash. Since I am not certain that you believe me when I say Wrone has done this, I enclose a copy of the page [20] in Wrone's essay where your Whitewash is listed for 1966 and the title page of Wrone's essay that he sent to me.

So this will close between you and me this trivial and childish matter over whether 1966 can be listed as a publication date for your Whitewash as I have done. Of course you may wish to write to Hurt, Summers, Blakey and Billings, and many others, and especially to Wrone and accuse them in your usual civil manner of making this colossal "factual error" on the publication date of Whitewash.

Sincerely,

Vincent P. De Santis

Vincent P. DeSantis

VPD:jeb

c.c. Walton R. Collins

- PP. 2 (Second), 3 (Continued) 11.10-10 (unrued " ")
- 4 (500 errors in Bishop's book)
- + 4 - Manchester's book full of errors
- + 6 - Code 500 Photographs & Motion Pictures
- + Photographic evidence faked, mutilated, altered
- + 6 - 10 unfair critics of Warren Comm.
- X 11-12 - 4 Careful Critics
- * 12-13 Summary of the Critics

THE TOOLS OF THE HISTORIAN AND THE ASSASSINATION OF JOHN F. KENNEDY
THE EVIDENTIARY BASE: A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF THE BASIC
FINDINGS OF 200 INVESTIGATORS OVER THE LAST 14 YEARS

By

David R. Wrone
Professor of History
University of Wisconsin-
Stevens Point

11/11/77

National Archives provided him, a commercial writer, with an office and complete access to all records of the Commission, something which no other writer on the assassination has enjoyed.

²⁴ Numerous protests were made to the Federal Communications Commission and to C.B.S. by the critics against the misrepresentations and distortions of the evidence. One illustration of C.B.S.'s misrepresentations is found in Josiah Thompson, Six Seconds in Dallas. A Micro-Study of the Kennedy Assassination (New York: Bernard Geis Associates, 1967), 292-296. Perhaps the best statement of criticism is the letter from Sylvia Meagher to Richard Salant, President of C.B.S., July 3, 1967, distributed to the press and interested parties. A copy of the four-page letter is in my file: "C.B.S.: Evidentiary Misrepresentations."

²⁵ Meagher to Salant; White, Should We Now, 201.

²⁶ Meagher to Salant; White, Should We Now.

²⁷ Meagher, Accessories After the Fact, 94-133; Weisberg, Whitewash: The Report on the Warren Report (New York: Dell, 1966), 64-75; interview Harold Weisberg, June 1977, based on his investigations. Meagher cites the evidentiary record which can also be found through her Subject Index to the Warren Report and Hearings and Exhibits (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms enlarged edition, 1971).

²⁸ Weisberg, Whitewash, 75; Meagher, Accessories After the Fact, 116-120.

²⁹ Weisberg, Whitewash, 258; Meagher, Accessories After the Fact, 45-64, 111-112, 127-131, 193-194.